A U M

All of us are brought to this study by our own request made to our Higher Self.
—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. L September, 1962 No. 11

WORK IN THE WORLD

THE account given in the second discourse of the *Bhagavad-Gita* of the self-governed sage is of considerable help in understanding the oscillations of history. He is one who "receives each event, whether favorable or unfavorable, with an equal mind," and, having met good and evil, "neither rejoiceth at the one nor is cast down by the other." *The Voice of the Silence* contributes another perspective: "Both action and inaction may find room in thee; thy body agitated, thy mind tranquil, thy soul as limpid as a mountain lake."

For the individual, this description applies to different levels of being within one man. But when the field of interest encompasses, not a single person, but the great human family, there is subdivision and specialization. Considered as types of the spectrum of human behavior, some men seem wholly in agitation, while others exhibit various degrees of approach to tranquility, and almost no one can be taken to represent the unmoved state of the perfect sage.

So it is with the talents and expressions of a particular age. A man of good will may play a healing and constructive role in the limited drama of an historical epoch, despite the fact that what he says and does, as an individual, may exhibit serious shortcomings by comparison with the ideal balance of the self-governed sage.

Students of Theosophy have it borne in upon them that the Wisdom Religion embodies the symmetrical truth which will one day be the common possession of the Golden Age. The precise nature of the communication of this wisdom by sages of perfect balance is its uncompromised symmetry. It gives no hostages to the various Caesars of the changing epochs of man. Much of the writing of H.P.B. was given to explaining why she would *not* adjust or tailor the emphasis of her presentation of the Secret Doctrine to suit the prejudices and intellectual and moral limitations of the scholars, scientists, and intellectuals of the

nineteenth century. Others might make such dilutions and compromises in the hope of gaining wider attention; she would not. As a matter of fact, it was inevitable that others *would* so water down Theosophy, according to their various understandings and special intentions. It is by such means that great reforms slowly penetrate the cultural atmosphere and cause countless individuals to find their own depth or level in the broad influence of the Theosophical Movement. This is a karmic process which is best left to the intellectual and moral dirigibility of the great mass of human beings. It is obvious that no real teacher would dilute or "step-down" *at the source* what he has to teach—not, that is, after choosing the level at which he determines to work, and which represents the highest potentialities of which the age is capable.

But since every man *is* at root a spiritual being, as well as the child of his times, each age will have its own expression of the best intuitions and intellectual embodiments, typifying the most that age can accomplish, "outside of initiation." The voices of the individuals who embody this expression may be expected to have a moral quality akin to the feeling of Theosophical students, while falling far short in terms of the symmetry that students have come to require in any statement that is to be compared on its merits with Theosophical teaching. Here, from the student's point of view, a comment of Jasper Niemand in *Letters That Have Helped Me* gives some illumination. "How shall we be proud when we are so small? How dare we be humble when we are so great? In both we blaspheme."

The point is that noble figures in history, when they exhibit those qualities of courage and commitment that we long to possess ourselves, are bound to make us humble; yet, from the student's knowledge of the symmetry of the teaching, he sees gaps and abysses in the *communicated* truth of the heroes and pioneers of his time. Here, the comparison is between the best truth of a moment of time, and the vaguely grasped truth which comes from beyond time. The contrast is instructive, but it is not a basis for the ordinary kind of criticism. It is a contrast between the best light that is possible outside of initiation, and the light of initiation which is but poorly understood by the student's quite imperfect powers of perception. Jasper's further comment is just in this situation:

> . . . there is that firm spot between the two which is the place "neither too high nor too low" on which Krishna told Arjuna to sit; a spot *of his own*. It is the firm place which our faith has won from the world. On it we are always to stand calmly, not overshadowed by any man

> however great, because each of us contains the potentialities of every other. "Not overshadowed" does not mean that we are not to show reverence to those through whom the soul speaks. . . . We are to examine thoughtfully all that comes to us from such persons, and all that comes to us from any source wearing the aspect of truth, and try faithfully to see wherein it may be true. . . .

Let us take as examples the vastly influential currents of thought in the modern world represented by the interest in Zen Buddhism and in Existentialist philosophy. Here, you could say, are strong motives of search for the Self without the aid of metaphysical assumptions and without the mediation of conceptual expressions of doctrine. The Theosophical student feels strongly that these aspects of the symmetry of the Wisdom Religion have been seriously neglected or wholly omitted from all such versions of "truth." What must then be remembered is that in looking at contemporary expressions of Zen and Existentialism, one is regarding *historical evolutions* of intellectual and moral inquiry, and not impartations from beyond the portals of initiation. They are time-bound expressions, confined by the limitations of past thinking. The antagonism of the modern mind to metaphysics has an excellent explanation in the aversion of disciplined minds to theology and all its pretensions, and in Western history theology is a close relative of metaphysics. No member of the theological family can enter the scientific mind of the present without submitting that mind to essential compromise. This, at any rate, is a kind of instinct in persons of honest rationalist discipline.

It follows that, in the world, the fear of metaphysics must be *worn out* by a slow process of development. The return to metaphysics will come in response to an urgently felt need, not upon the insistence of those who would like to "instruct" the lagging scientific or modern mind. A long step in this direction will have been accomplished once the stark intuitions of self-hood implicit in these forms of thought begin to demand a framework of rational postulates. But this takes time.

Meanwhile, the world has its courageous men in literature, the arts, the drama, in psychology and social science, and in various phases of the peace movement, who reflect certain primary convictions that relate to the principles of the Theosophical Movement. They do not exhibit awareness of the "whole teaching"—how could they? Yet they are doing something that in all likelihood could be accomplished by no one else. And the Theosophists, as H.P.B. said in *Lucifer* many years ago, have another work to do.

THE POPULAR IDEA OF SOUL-SURVIVAL

AT what epoch the dawning intellect of man first accepted the idea of future life, none can tell. But we know that, from the very first, its roots struck so deeply, so entwined about human instincts, that the belief has endured through all generations, and is imbedded in the consciousness of every nation and tribe, civilized, semi-civilized or savage. The greatest minds have speculated upon it; and the rudest savages, though having no name for the Deity, have yet believed in the existence of spirits and worshipped them. If, in Christian Russia, Wallachia, Bulgaria and Greece, the Oriental Church enjoins that upon All-Saints day offerings of rice and drink shall be placed upon the graves; and in "heathen" India, the same propitiatory gifts of rice are made to the departed; so, likewise, the poor savage of New Caledonia makes his sacrifice of food to the skulls of his beloved dead.

According to Herbert Spencer, the worship of souls and relics is to be attributed to "the primitive idea that any property characterizing an aggregate, inheres in all parts of it. . . . The soul, present in the body of the dead man preserved entire, is also present in the preserved parts of his body. Hence, the faith in relics." This definition, though in logic equally applicable to the gold-enshrined and bejewelled relic of the cultured Roman Catholic devotee, and to the dusty, time-worn skull of the fetish worshipper, might yet be excepted to by the former, since he would say that he does not believe the soul to be present in either the whole cadaver, skeleton, or part, nor does he, strictly speaking, worship it. He but honours the relic as something which, having belonged to one whom he deems saintly, has by the contact acquired a sort of miraculous virtue. Mr. Spencer's definition, therefore, does not seem to cover the whole ground. So also Professor Max Müller, in his *Science of Religion,* after having shown to us, by citing numerous instances, that the human mind had, from the beginning, a "vague hope of a future life," explains no more than Herbert Spencer whence or how came originally such a hope. But merely points to an inherent faculty in *uncultivated* nations of changing the forces of nature into gods and demons. He

---

NOTE.—This editorial by H. P. Blavatsky was first printed in the *Theosophist* for December, 1879, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for October, 1917.

closes his lecture upon the Turanian legends and the universality of this belief in ghosts and spirits, by simply remarking that the worship of the spirits of the departed is the most widely spread form of *superstition* all over the world.

Thus, whichever way we turn for a philosophical solution of the mystery; whether we expect an answer from theology which is itself bound to believe in miracles, and teach supernaturalism; or ask it from the now dominant schools of modern thought—the greatest opponents of the miraculous in nature; or, again, turn for an explanation to that philosophy of extreme positivism which, from the days of Epicurus down to the modern school of James Mill, adopting for its device the glaring sciolism *"nihil in intellectu quod non ante fuerit in sensu,"* makes intellect subservient to matter—we receive a satisfactory reply from none!

If this article were intended merely for a simple collation of facts, authenticated by travellers on the spot, and concerning but "superstitions" born in the mind of the primitive man, and now lingering only among the savage tribes of humanity, then the combined works of such philosophers as Herbert Spencer might solve our difficulties. We might remain content with his explanation that in the absence of hypothesis "foreign to thought in its earliest stage . . . primitive ideas, arising out of various experiences, derived from the inorganic world"—such as the actions of wind, the echo, and man's own shadow—proving to the uneducated mind that there was "an invisible form of existence which manifests power," were all sufficient to have created a like "inevitable belief" (see Spencer's *Genesis of Superstition*). But we are now concerned with something nearer to us, and higher than the primitive man of the stone age; the man who totally ignored "those conceptions of physical causation which have arisen only as experiences, and have been slowly organized during civilization." We are now dealing with the beliefs of twenty millions of modern Spiritualists; our own fellow men, living in the full blaze of the enlightened 19th century. These men ignore none of the discoveries of modern science; nay, many among them are themselves ranked high among the highest of such scientific discoverers. Notwithstanding all this, are they any the less addicted to the same, "form of superstition," if superstition it be, than the primitive man? At least their interpretations of the physical phenomena, whenever accompanied by those coincidences which carry to their minds the

conviction of an intelligence behind the physical Force—are often precisely the same as those which presented themselves to the apprehension of the man of the early and undeveloped ages.

What is a shadow? asks Herbert Spencer. By a child and a savage "a shadow is thought of as an entity." Bastian says of the Benin negroes, that "they regard men's shadows as their souls" . . . thinking "they . . . watch all their actions, and bear witness against them." According to Crantz, among the Greenlanders a man's shadow is called "the dark spirit, as distinguished from another which each man possesses." And the celebrated author of the "Principles of Psychology" explains that "the community of meaning, hereafter to be noted more fully, which various unallied languages betray between shade and spirit, show us the same thing."

What all this shows us the most clearly however, is that, wrong and contradicting as the conclusions may be, yet the premises on which they are based are no fictions. A thing must be, before the human mind can think or conceive of it. The very capacity to imagine the existence of something usually invisible and intangible, is itself evidence that it must have manifested itself at some time. Sketching in his usual artistic way the gradual development of the soul-idea, and pointing out at the same time how "*mythology* not only pervades the sphere of religion . . . but, infects more or less the whole realm of thought," Professor Müller in his turn tells us that, when men wished for the first time to express "a distinction between the body, and something else within him distinct from the body . . . the name that suggested itself was *breath,* chosen to express at first the principle of life as distinguished from the decaying body, afterwards the incorporeal . . . immortal part of man—his soul, his mind, his self . . . when a person dies, we, too, say that he has given up the ghost, and ghost, too, meant originally spirit, and spirit meant breath." As instances of this, narratives by various missionaries and travellers are quoted. Questioned by Father R. de Bobadilla, soon after the Spanish conquest, as to their ideas concerning death, the Indians of Nicaragua told him that "when men die, there comes forth from their mouth something which resembles a person and is called *Julio* (in Aztec *yuli* 'to live'—explains M. Müller). This being is like a person, but does not die and the corpse remains here. . . . In one of his numerous works, Andrew Jackson Davis, whilom considered the greatest American clairvoyant and known as the "Poughkeepsie Seer," gives us what is a perfect

illustration of the belief of the Nicaragua Indians. This book (*Death and the After Life*) contains an engraved frontispiece, representing the death-bed of an old woman. It is called the "Formation of the Spiritual Body." Out of the head of the defunct, there issues a luminous appearance—her own rejuvenated form.[1]

Among some Hindus the spirit is supposed to remain for ten days seated on the eaves of the house where it parted from the body. That it may bathe and drink, two plantain leaf-cups are placed on the eaves, one full of milk and the other of water. "On the first day the dead is supposed to get his head; on the second day his ears, eyes, and nose; on the third, his hands, breast, and neck; on the fourth, his middle parts; on the fifth, his legs and feet; on the sixth, his vitals; on the seventh, his bones, marrow, veins and arteries; on the eighth, his nails, hair, and teeth; on the ninth, all the remaining limbs, organs, and manly strength; and, on the tenth, hunger and thirst for the renewed body." (*The Patane Prabhus,* by Krishnanath Raghunathji; in the Government Bombay Gazetteer, 1879.)

Mr. Davis's theory is accepted by all the Spiritualists, and it is on this model that the clairvoyants now describe the separation of the "incorruptible from the corruptible." But here, Spiritualists and the Aztecs branch off into two paths; for, while the former maintain that the soul is in every case immortal and preserves its individuality throughout eternity, the Aztecs say that "when the deceased has lived well, the julio goes up on high with our gods; but when he has lived ill, the julio perishes with the body, and there is an end of it."

Some persons might perchance find the "primitive" Aztecs more consistent in their logic than our modern Spiritualists. The Laponians and Finns also maintain that while the body decays, a *new* one is given to the dead, which the Shaman can alone see.

---

[1] "Suppose a person is dying," says the Poughkeepsie Seer: "The clairvoyant sees right over the head what may be called a magnetic halo—an ethereal emanation, in appearance golden, and throbbing as though conscious. . . . The person has ceased to breathe, the pulse is still, and the emanation is elongated *and fashioned in the outline of the human form!* Beneath it, is connected the brain. . . . owing to the brain's momentum. I have seen a dying person, even at the last feeble pulse-beat, rouse impulsively and rise up in bed to converse, but the next instant he was gone—his brain being the last to yield up the life-principles. The golden emanation . . . is connected with the brain by a very fine life-thread. When it ascends, there appears something *white* and *shining* like a human head; next, a faint outline of the face *divine;* then the *fair* neck and *beautiful* shoulders; then, in rapid succession come all parts of the new body, down to the feet—a bright shining image, a little smaller than the physical body, but a perfect prototype . . . in all except its disfigurements. The fine life-thread continues attached to the old brain. The next thing is the withdrawal of the electric principle. When this thread snaps, the spiritual body is free (!) and prepared to accompany its guardian to the Summer Land."

"Though breath, or spirit, or ghost," says further on Professor Müller, "are the most common names . . . we yet speak of the *shades* of the departed, which meant originally their shadows. . . . Those who first introduced this expression—and we find it in the most distant parts of the world—evidently took the shadow as the nearest approach to what they wished to express; something that should be incorporeal, yet closely connected with the body. The Greek *eidolon,* too, is not much more than the shadow . . . but the curious part is this . . . that people who speak of the life or soul as the shadow of the body, have brought themselves to believe that a dead body casts no shadow, because the shadow has departed from it; that it becomes, in fact, a kind of Peter Schemihl." ("The Science of Religion".)

Do the Amazulu and other tribes of South Africa only thus believe? By no means; it is a popular idea among Slavonian Christians. A corpse which is noticed to cast a shadow in the sun is deemed a sinful soul rejected by heaven itself. It is doomed henceforth to expiate its sins as an earth-bound spirit, till the Day of the Resurrection.

Both Lander and Catlin describe the savage Mandans as placing the skulls of their dead in a circle. Each wife knows the skull of her former husband or child, and there seldom passes a day that she does not visit it, with a dish of the best cooked food. . . . There is scarcely an hour in a pleasant day but more or less of these women may be seen sitting or lying by the skulls of their children or husbands—talking to them in the most endearing language that they can use (as they were wont to do in former days) "and *seemingly getting an answer back.*" (Quoted by Herbert Spencer in *Fetish-worship.*)

What these poor, savage Mandan mothers and wives do, is performed daily by millions of civilized Spiritualists, and but the more proves the universality of the conviction that our dead hear and can answer us. From a theosophical, magnetic,—hence in a certain sense a scientific—standpoint, the former have, moreover, far better reasons to offer than the latter. The skull of the departed person, so interrogated, has surely closer magnetical affinities and relations to the defunct, than a table through the tippings of which the dead ones answer the living; a table, in most cases, which the spirit while embodied had never seen nor touched. But the Spiritualists are not the only ones to vie with the Mandans. In every part of Russia, whether mourning over the yet fresh corpse or accompanying it to the burying ground, or during the six

weeks following the death, the peasant women as well as those of the rich mercantile classes, go on the grave to shout, or in Biblical phraseology to "lift up their voices." Once there, they wail in rhythm, addressing the defunct by name, asking of him questions, pausing as if for an answer.

Not only the ancient and idolatrous Egyptian and Peruvian had the curious notion that the ghost or soul of the dead man was either present in the mummy, or that the corpse was itself conscious, but there is a similar belief now among the orthodox Christians of the Greek and the Roman churches. We reproach the Egyptians with placing their embalmed dead at the table; and the heathen Peruvians with having carried around the fields the dried-up corpse of a parent, that it might see and judge of the state of the crops. But what of the Christian Mexican to-day, who under the guidance of his priest, dresses up his corpses in finery, bedecks them with flowers, and in case of the defunct happening to be a female —even paints its cheeks with rouge. Then seating the body in a chair placed on a large table, from which the ghastly carrion presides, as it were, over the mourners seated around the table, who eat and drink the whole night and play various games of cards and dice, consult the defunct as to their chances. On the other hand, in Russia, it is a universal custom to crown the deceased person's brow with a long slip of gilt and ornamented paper, called *Ventchik* (the crown), upon which a prayer is printed in gaudy letters. This prayer is a kind of a letter of introduction with which the parish priest furnishes the corpse to his patron Saint, recommending the defunct to the Saint's protection.[2] The Roman Catholic Basques write letters to their deceased friends and relatives, addressing them to either Paradise, Purgatory or—Hell, according to the instructions given by the Father confessor of the late addressees—and, placing them in the coffins of the newly departed, ask the latter to safely deliver them in the other world, promising as a fee to the messenger, more or less masses for the repose of his soul.

At a recent *séance,* held by a well known medium in America,—(see *Banner of Light,* Boston, June 14th, 1879).

> Mercedes, late Queen of Spain, announced herself, and came forth in full bridal array—a magnificent profusion of lace and jewels, and spoke in several different tongues with a linguist present. Her sister, the

[2] It runs in this wise: "St. Nicholas, (or St. Mary So-and-so) holy patron of—(follow defunct's full name and title) receive the soul of God's servant, and intercede for remission of his (or her) sins."

Princess Christina, came also just after in much plainer costume, and with a timid school-girl air.

Thus, we see that not only can the dead people deliver letters, but, even returning from their celestial homes, bring back with them their "lace and jewels." As the ancient pagan Greek peopled his Olympian heaven with feasting and flirting deities; and the American red Indian has his happy hunting-grounds where the spirits of brave chiefs bestride their ghostly steeds, and chase their phantom game; and the Hindu his many superior lokas, where their numerous gods live in golden palaces, surrounded with all manner of sensual delights; and the Christian his New Jerusalem with streets of "pure gold, as it were transparent glass," and the foundations of the wall of the city "garnished . . . with precious stones;" where bodiless chirping cherubs and the elect, with golden harps, sing praises to Jehovah; so the modern Spiritualist has his "Summer Land Zone within the milky way,"[3] though somewhat higher than the celestial territories of other people.[4] There, amid cities and villages abounding in palaces, museums, villas, colleges and temples, an eternity is passed. The young are nurtured and taught, the undeveloped of the earth matured, the old rejuvenated, and every individual taste and desire gratified; spirits flirt, get married, and have families of children.[5]

Verily, verily we can exclaim with Paul, "O death where is thy sting; O grave, where is thy victory!" Belief in the survival of the ancestors is the oldest and most time honoured of all beliefs.

Travellers tell us that all the Mongolian, Tartar, Finnish, and Tunguisic tribes, besides the spirits of nature, deify also their ancestral spirits. The Chinese historians, treating of the Turanians, the Huns and the *Tukui*—the forefathers of the modern Turks—show them as worshipping "the spirits of the sky, of the earth, and the spirits of the departed." Medhurst enumerates the various classes of the Chinese spirits

[3] See "Stellar key to the Summer Land" by Andrew Jackson Davis.

[4] In the same author's work—"The Spiritual Congress," Galen says through the clairvoyant seer: "Between the Spirit Home and the earth, there are, strewn along the intervening distance . . . more than *four hundred thousand* planets, and *fifteen thousand* solar bodies of lesser magnitude."

[5] The latest intelligence from America is that of the marriage of a spirit daughter of Colonel Eaton, of Leavenworth, Kansas, a prominent member of the National Democratic Committee. This daughter, who died at the age of three weeks, grew in some twenty odd years in the Summer-Land, to be a fine young lady and now is wedded to the spirit son of Franklin Pierce, late President of the U. S. The wedding, witnessed by a famous clairvoyant of New York, was gorgeous. The "spirit bride" was "arrayed in a dress of mild green." A wedding supper was spread by the spirit's order, with lights and bouquets, and plates placed for the happy couple. The guests assembled, and the wedded ghosts fully "materialized" themselves and sat at table with them. (New York *Times*, June 29th, 1879.)

thus: The principal are the celestial spirits (*tien shin*); the terrestrial (*ti-ki*); and the ancestral or wandering spirits (*jin kwei*). Among these, the spirits of the late Emperors, great philosophers, and sages, are revered the most. They are the public property of the whole nation, and are a part of the state religion, "while each family has, besides this, its own *manes*, which are treated with great regard; incense is burned before their relics, and many superstitious rites performed."

But if all nations equally believe in, and many worship, their dead, their views as to the desirability of a direct intercourse with these late citizens differ widely. In fact, among the educated, only the modern Spiritualists seek to communicate constantly with them. We will take a few instances from the most widely separated peoples. The Hindus, as a rule, hold that no pure spirit, of a man who died reconciled to his fate, will ever come back bodily to trouble mortals. They maintain that it is only the *bhutas*—the souls of those who depart this life, unsatisfied, and having their terrestrial desires unquenched, in short, bad, sinful men and women—who became "earth-bound." Unable to ascend at once to Moksha, they have to linger upon earth until either their next transmigration or complete annihilation; and thus take every opportunity to obsess people, especially weak women. So undesirable is to them the return or apparition of such ghosts, that they use every means to prevent it. Even in the case of the most holy feeling—the mother's love for her infant—they adopt measures to prevent her return to it. There is a belief among some of them that whenever a woman dies in child-birth, she will return to see and watch over the child. Therefore, on their way back from the ghaut, after the burning of the body,—the mourners thickly strew mustard seeds all along the road leading from the funeral pile to the defunct's home. For some unconceivable reasons they think that the ghost will feel obliged to pick up, on its way back, every one of these seeds. And, as the labor is slow and tedious, the poor mother can never reach her home before the cock crows, when she is obliged—in accordance with the ghostly laws—to vanish, till the following night, dropping back all her harvest. Among the Tchuvashes, a tribe inhabiting Russian domains (Castren's "Finaische Mythologie." p. 122), a son, whenever offering sacrifice to the spirit of his father, uses the following exorcism: "We honour thee with a feast; look here is bread for thee, and various kinds of food; thou hast all thou canst desire: but do not trouble us, do not come back near us." Among the Lapps and

Finns, those departed spirits, which make their presence visible and tangible, are supposed to be very mischievous and "the most michievous are the spirits of the priests." Everything is done to keep them away from the living. The agreement we find between this blind popular instinct and the wise conclusions of some of the greatest philosophers, and even modern specialists, is very remarkable. "Respect the spirits and—keep them at a distance"—said Confucius, six centuries B. C. Nine centuries later, Porphyry, the famous anti-theurgist, writing upon the nature of various spirits, expressed his opinion upon the spirits of the departed by saying that *he knew of no evil* which these pestilent demons would not be ready to do. And, in our own century, a kabalist, the greatest magnetizer living, Baron Dupotet, in his "Magie Devoileè," warns the spiritists not to trouble the rest of the dead. For "the evoked shadow can *fasten itself* upon, follow, and for ever afterwards influence you; and we can appease it but through a pact which will bind us to it—till death!"

But all this is a matter of individual opinion; what we are concerned with now is merely to learn how the basic fact of belief in soul-survival could have so engrafted itself upon every succeeding age,—despite the extravagances woven into it—if it be but a shadowy and unreal intellectual conception originating with "primitive man." Of all modern men of science, although he does his best in the body of the work to present the belief alluded to as a mere "superstition"—the only satisfactory answer is given by Prof. Max Müller, in his "Introduction to the Science of Religion." And by his solution we have to abide for want of a better one. He can only do it, however, by overstepping the boundaries of comparative philology, and boldly invading the domain of pure metaphysics; by following, in short, a path forbidden by exact science. At one blow he cuts the Gordian knot which Herbert Spencer and his school have tied under the chariot of the "Unknowable." He shows us that: "there is a philosophical discipline which examines into the conditions of sensuous or intuitional knowledge," and "another philosophical discipline which examines into the conditions of rational or conceptual knowledge;" and then defines for us a third faculty. . . . "The faculty of apprehending the Infinite, not only in religion but in all things; a power independent of sense and reason, a power in a certain sense contradicted by sense and reason, but yet a very real power, which has held its own from the beginning of the world, neither sense nor reason being able to overcome it, while it alone is able to overcome both reason and sense."

The faculty of *Intuition*—that which lies entirely beyond the scope of our modern biologists—could hardly be better defined. And yet, when closing his lecture upon the superstitious rites of the Chinese, and their temples devoted to the worship of the departed ancestors, our great philologist remarks: "All this takes place by slow degrees; it begins with placing a flower on the tomb; it ends—with worshipping the Spirits. . . ."

The More Authentic Sphere

Admiring the world of sense as we look out upon its vastness and beauty and the order of its eternal march, thinking of the gods within it, seen and hidden, and the celestial spirits and all the life of animal and plant, let us mount to its archetype, to the yet more authentic sphere: there we are to contemplate all things as members of the Intellectual—eternal in their own right, vested with a self-springing consciousness and life—and, presiding over all these, the unsoiled Intelligence and the unapproachable Wisdom.

Here is contained all that is immortal: nothing here but a Divine Mind; all is God. Its knowing is not by search but by possession, its blessedness inherent, not acquired. Soul deals with thing after thing—now Socrates; now a horse: always some one entity from among beings—but the Intellectual-Principle is all and therefore its entire content is simultaneously present in that identity: this is pure Being in eternal actuality. And everything, in that entire content is Intellectual-Principle and Authentic Existence, and the total of all is Intellectual Principle entire and Being entire.

—Plotinus

POINTS OF AGREEMENT IN ALL RELIGIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Let me read you a few verses from some of the ancient Scriptures of the world, from the old Indian books held sacred by the Brahmans of Hindustan.

"What room for doubt and what room for sorrow is there in him who knows that all spiritual beings are the same in kind and only differ from each other in degree?"

"The sun does not shine there, nor the moon and the stars, nor these lightnings, and much less this fire. When He shines, everything shines after Him; by His light all this is lighted.

Lead me from the unreal to the real!

Lead me from darkness to light!

Lead me from death to immortality!

Seeking for refuge, I go to that God who is the light of His own thoughts; He who first creates Brahman and delivers the Vedas to him; who is without parts, without actions, tranquil, without fault, the highest bridge to immortality, like a fire that has consumed its fuel."—*Mundaka Upanishad.*

Such are some of the verses, out of many thousands, which are enshrined in the ancient Hindu Vedas beloved by those we have called "heathen"; those are the sentiments of the people we have called idolaters only.

As the representative of the Theosophical movement I am glad to be here, and to be assigned to speak on what are the points of agreement in all religions. I am glad because Theosophy is to be found in all religions and all sciences. We, as members of the Theosophical Society, endorse to the fullest extent those remarks of your chairman in opening, when he said, in effect, that a theology which stayed in one spot without

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed in the *Path* for July, 1894. It was an address delivered April 17th, 1894, before the Parliament of Religions at San Francisco, Calif., by William Q. Judge. It was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for March, 1915.

The Midwinter Fair at San Francisco had annexed to it a Religious Parliament modeled after the first great one of 1893 at Chicago. Dr. J. D. Buck and William Q. Judge, the latter as General Secretary American Section, were officially invited to address the Parliament at one of its sessions as representatives of the Theosophical movement. Time was so short that all speakers were limited to thirty minutes each; for that reason the address is not as full as it would be had more time been granted. But the occasion once more showed the strength of the T. S. movement.

advancing was not a true theology, but that we had advanced to where theology should include a study of man. Such a study must embrace his various religions, both dead and living. And pushing that study into those regions we must conclude that man is greatly his own revealer, has revealed religion to himself, and therefore that all religions must include and contain truth; that no one religion is entitled to a patent or exclusive claim upon truth or revelation, or is the only one that God has given to man, or the only road along which man can walk to salvation. If this be not true, then your Religious Parliament is no Parliament, but only a body of men admiring themselves and their religion. But the very existence of this Parliament proclaims the truth of what I have said and shows the need which the Theosophical Society has for nineteen years been asserting, of a dutiful, careful, and brotherly inquiry into all the religions of the world, for the purpose of discovering what the central truths are upon which each and every religion rests, and what the original fountain from which they have come. This careful and tolerant inquiry is what we are here for today; for that the Theosophical Society stands and has stood; for toleration, for unity, for the final and irrevocable death of all dogmatism.

But if you say that religion must have been revealed, then surely God did not wait for several millions of years before giving it to those poor beings called men. He did not, surely, wait until He found one poor Semitic tribe to whom He might give it late in the life of the race? Hence He must have given it in the very beginning, and therefore all present religions must arise from one fount.

What are the great religions of the world and from whence have they come? They are Christianity, Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, and Mohammedanism. The first named is the youngest, with all its warring sects, with Mormonism as an offshoot and with Roman Catholicism boldly claiming sole precedence and truth.

Brahmanism is the old and hoary religion of India, a grown-up, fully-developed system long before either Buddhism or Christianity was born. It extends back to the night of time, and throws the history of religion far, far beyond any place where modern investigators were once willing to place even the beginning of religious thought. Almost the ancient of ancients, it stands in far-off India, holding its holy Vedas in its hands, calmly waiting until the newer West shall find time out of the pursuit of material wealth to examine the treasures it contains.

Buddhism, the religion of Ceylon, of parts of China, of Burmah and Japan and Tibet, comes after its parent Brahmanism. It is historically older than Christianity and contains the same ethics as the latter, the same laws and the same examples, similar saints and identical fables and tales relating to Lord Buddha, the Saviour of Men. It embraces today, after some twenty-five hundred years of life, more people than any other religion, for two-thirds of the human family profess it.

Zoroastrianism also fades into the darkness of the past. It too teaches ethics such as we know. Much of its ritual and philosophy is not understood, but the law of brotherly love is not absent from it; it teaches justice and truth, charity and faith in God, together with immortality. In these it agrees with all, but it differs from Christianity in not admitting a vicarious salvation, which it says is not possible.

Christianity of today is modern Judaism, but the Christianity of Jesus is something different. He taught forgiveness, Moses taught retaliation, and that is the law today in Christian State and Church. "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" is still the recognized rule, but Jesus taught the opposite. He fully agreed with Buddha, who, preaching 500 years before the birth of the Jewish reformer, said we must love one another and forgive our enemies. So modern Christianity is not the religion of Jesus, but Buddhism and the religion of Jesus accord with one another in calling for charity, complete tolerance, perfect non-resistance, absolute self-abnegation.

If we compare Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism together on the points of ritual, dogmas, and doctrines, we find not only agreement but a marvellous similarity as well, which looks like an imitation on the part of the younger Christianity. Did the more modern copy the ancient? It would seem probable. And some of the early Christian Fathers were in the habit of saying, as we find in their writings, that Christianity brought nothing new into the world, that it existed from all time.

If we turn to ritual, so fully exemplified in the Roman Catholic Church, we find the same practices and even similar clothing and altar arrangements in Buddhism, while many of the prescribed rules for the altar and approaching or leaving it are mentioned very plainly in far more ancient directions governing the Brahman when acting as priest. This similarity was so wonderful in the truthful account given by the Catholic priest Abbé Huc that the alarmed Church first explained that the devil, knowing that Christianity was coming, went ahead and in-

vented the whole thing for the Buddhists by a species of *ante facto* copying, so as to confound innocent Catholics therewith; and then they burned poor Abbé Huc's book. As to stations of the cross, now well known to us, or the rosary, confession, convents, and the like, all these are in the older religion. The rosary was long and anciently used in Japan, where they had over one hundred and seventy-two sorts. And an examination of the mummies of old Egypt reveals rosaries placed with them in the grave, many varieties being used. Some of these I have seen. Could we call up the shades of Babylon's priests, we should doubtless find the same rituals there.

Turning to doctrines, that of salvation by faith is well known in Christianity. It was the cause of a stormy controversy in the time of St. James. But very strangely, perhaps, for many Christians, the doctrine is a very old Brahmanical one. They call it "The Bridge Doctrine," as it is the great Bridge. But with them it does not mean a faith in some particular emanation of God, but God is its aim, God is the means and the way, and God the end of the faith; by complete faith in God, without an intermediary, God will save you. They also have a doctrine of salvation by faith in those great sons of God, Krishna, Rama, and others; complete faith in either of those is for them a way to heaven, a bridge for the crossing over all sins. Even those who were killed by Krishna, in the great war detailed in the *Ramayana,* went straight to heaven because they looked at him, as the thief on the cross looking at Jesus went to Paradise. In Buddhism is the same doctrine of faith. The twelve great sects of Buddhism in Japan have one called the Sect of the Pure Land. This teaches that Amitabha vowed that any one who calls three times on his name would be born into his pure Land of Bliss. He held that some men may be strong enough to prevail against the enemy, but that most men are not, and need some help from another. This help is found in the power of the vow of Amita Buddha, who will help all those who call on his name. The doctrine is a modified form of vicarious atonement, but it does not exclude the salvation by works which the Christian St. James gives out.

Heaven and Hell are also common to Christianity, Buddhism, and Brahmanism. The Brahman calls it Swarga; the Buddhist, Devachan; and we, Heaven. Its opposite is Naraka and Avitchi. But names apart, the descriptions are the same. Indeed, the hells of the Buddhists are very terrible, long in duration and awful in effect. The difference is that

the heaven and hell of the Christian are eternal, while the others are not. The others come to an end when the forces which cause them are exhausted. In teaching of more than one heaven there is the same likeness, for St. Paul spoke of more than a single heaven to one of which he was rapt away, and the Buddhist tells of many, each being a grade above or below some other. Brahman and Buddhist agree in saying that when heaven or hell is ended for the soul, it descends again to rebirth. And that was taught by the Jews. They held that the soul was originally pure, but sinned and had to wander through rebirth until purified and fit to return to its source.

In priesthood and priestcraft there is a perfect agreement among all religions, save that the Brahman instead of being ordained a priest is so by birth. Buddha's priesthood began with those who were his friends and disciples. After his death they met in council, and subsequently many councils were held, all being attended by priests. Similar questions arose among them as with the Christians, and identical splits occurred, so that now there are Northern and Southern Buddhism and the twelve sects of Japan. During the life of Buddha the old query of admitting women arose and caused much discussion. The power of the Brahman and Buddhist priests is considerable, and they demand as great privileges and rights as the Christian ones.

Hence we are bound to conclude that dogmatically and theologically these religions all agree. Christianity stands out, however, as peculiarly intolerant—and in using the word "intolerant" I but quote from some priestly utterances regarding the World's Fair Parliament—for it claims to be the only true religion that God has seen fit to reveal to man.

The great doctrine of a Saviour who is the son of God—God himself—is not an original one with Christianity. It is the same as the extremely ancient one of the Hindus called the doctrine of the Avatar. An Avatar is one who comes down to earth to save man. He is God incarnate. Such was Krishna, and such even the Hindus admit was Buddha, for he is one of the great ten Avatars. The similarity between Krishna or Cristna and Christ has been very often remarked. He came 5,000 years ago to save and benefit man, and his birth was in India, his teaching being Brahmanical. He, like Jesus, was hated by the ruler, Kansa, who desired to destroy him in advance, and who destroyed many sons of families in order to accomplish his end, but failed. Krishna warred with the powers of darkness in his battles with Ravana, whom he finally killed.

The belief about him was that he was the incarnation of God. This is in accord with the ancient doctrine that periodically the Great Being assumes the form of man for the preservation of the just, the establishment of virtue and order, and the punishment of the wicked. Millions of men and women read every day of Krishna in the *Ramayana* of Tulsi Das. His praises are sung each day and reiterated at their festivals. Certainly it seems rather narrow and bigoted to assume that but one tribe and one people are favored by the appearance among them of an incarnation in greater measure of God.

Jesus taught a secret doctrine to his disciples. He said to them that he taught the common people in stories of a simple sort, but that the disciples learn of the mysteries. And in the early age of Christianity that secret teaching was known. In Buddhism is the same thing, for Buddha began with one vehicle or doctrine, proceeded after to two, and then to a third. He also taught a secret doctrine that doubtless agreed with the Brahmans who had taught him at his father's court. He gave up the world, and later gave up eternal peace in Nirvana, so that he might save men. In this the story agrees with that of Jesus. And Buddha also resisted Mara, or the Devil, in the wilderness. Jesus teaches that we must be as perfect as the Father, and that the kingdom of heaven is within each. To be perfect as the Father we must be equal with him, and hence here we have the ancient doctrine taught of old by the Brahmins that each man is God and a part of God. This supports the unity of humanity as a spiritual whole, one of the greatest doctrines of the time prior to Christianity, and now also believed in Brahmanism.

That the universe is spiritual in essence, that man is a spirit and immortal, and that man may rise to perfection, are universal doctrines. Even particular doctrines are common to all the religions. Reincarnation is not alone in Hinduism or Buddhism. It was believed by the Jews, and not only believed by Jesus but he also taught it. For he said that John the Baptist was the reincarnation of Elias "who was for to come." Being a Jew he must have had the doctrines of the Jews, and this was one of them. And in Revelations we find the writer says: "Him that overcometh I will make a pillar in the house of my God, and he shall go out no more."

The words "no more" infer a prior time of going out.

The perfectibility of man destroys the doctrine of original sin, and it was taught by Jesus, as I said. Reincarnation is a necessity for the

evolution of this perfection, and through it at last are produced those Saviors of the race of whom Jesus was one. He did not deny similar privileges to others, but said to his disciples that they could do even greater works than he did. So we find these great Sages and Saviors in all religions. There are Moses and Abraham and Solomon, all Sages. And we are bound to accept the Jewish idea that Moses and the rest were the reincarnations of former persons. Moses was in their opinion Abel the son of Adam; and their Messiah was to be a reincarnation of Adam himself who had already come the second time in the person of David. We take the Messiah and trace him up to David, but refuse, improperly, to accept the remainder of their theory.

Descending to every-day-life doctrines, we find that of Karma or that we must account and receive for every act. This is the great explainer of human life. It was taught by Jesus and Matthew and St. Paul. The latter explicitly said:

"Brethren, be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap."

This is Karma of the Brahman and Buddhist, which teaches that each life is the outcome of a former life or lives, and that every man in his rebirths will have to account for every thought and receive measure for the measure given by him before.

In ethics all these religions are the same, and no new ethic is given by any. Jesus was the same as his predecessor Buddha, and both taught the law of love and forgiveness. A consideration of the religions of the past and today from a Theosophical standpoint will support and confirm ethics. We therefore cannot introduce a new code, but we strive by looking into all religions to find a firm basis, not due to fear, favor, or injustice, for the ethics common to all. This is what Theosophy is for and what it will do. It is the reformer of religion, the unifier of diverse systems, the restorer of justice to our theory of the universe. It is our past, our present, and our future; it is our life, our death, and our immortality.

QUESTION—AND COMMENT

ONE recent meeting discussion was on the subject, "The Scheme of Evolution." What is it about the word "scheme" or "plan" which alternately appeals and repels? This seems to be a fairly common psychological reaction among students. It certainly has been so in the case of the person inquiring.

If, in each human being, there is a "will to meaning," one can readily understand the appeal of any description of life's interrelations which suggests a harmonious fulfillment based on understanding and accord. Every lesser intelligence becomes a greater, and in the process realizes a conception of order which may be described as a sort of "plan" or "scheme." To be able to believe that one is fulfilling a significant role in the vast drama of life, that the story, so to speak, has a point, is to have an encouraging and perhaps necessary faith. Yet, as with all abstruse metaphysical questions, the tendency of the many religions of the world has been to answer such questions too soon and in oversimplified manner. The life of a Buddha or a Christ indicates that the attainment of *attitudes* such as they embodied is the natural focus of evolutionary struggle towards enlightenment. But when the scheme is institutionalized, when salvation is substituted for self-realization, when priests and theologians unite in providing specifics of the course that must be followed to attain Buddhahood or Christhood, the conception of "scheme" or "plan" becomes static.

A passage from Macneile Dixon in *The Human Situation* makes some excellent points in this regard. Discussing the hope of "security" in a particular "plan"—for which God becomes an appropriate, if stultifying, symbol—Dixon writes:

> The world has been called *theatrum Dei,* God's theatre. And if we were merely players on the stage, repeating words put into our mouths, performing actions assigned to us, and like them really unconcerned, appearing to suffer and yet not suffering, the situation were beyond rebuke. That the world is not to their mind has never ceased to surprise, if not to exasperate the [Christian] philosophers. Its pattern displeases them, and they would remould it nearer to their hearts' desire. By some natural talent they perceive its deficiencies, but the plan of operations is kept a secret. Alfonso the Wise of Spain, indeed, remarked that "he could have suggested improvements in the universe had the Creator

> consulted him." Unfortunately at that moment a terrible thunderstorm burst over the Alcazar, and there is no record of his proposals, if he had any.

In terms of Eastern thought, "the scheme of evolution" means simply a provision—arising from opportunity provided by cyclic law—for gradually exhausting the karma of many lives on earth. If the "Divine plan" culminates in the exhaustion of karma, complete fulfilment is reached when incarnation is no longer necessary. With this viewpoint theological Christianity has much in common, save that the terms are less abstract and it is made possible for the simplest soul to believe that God knows the plan, even if it is beyond mortal understanding.

Another paragraph from Dixon is useful here:

> The truth is that Christianity did not, as is commonly supposed, convert Europe. On the contrary, Europe transformed Christianity. It was an Eastern and ascetic creed, a creed of withdrawal from life rather than of participation in its fierce conflicts and competitions, and was so understood in the early centuries. But the Western races were not prepared to abandon the world. Their energies were too great, the natural man in them unsubduable. So it came about that Christianity came to terms with the West, and the accommodation resulted in an ill-defined compromise. The world, indeed, is not our home, which is God, they said, but we are here by His will and inscrutable purpose.

Dixon suggests some historical and cultural reasons for the ambivalence present students feel when they encounter such a phrase as "scheme of evolution." The personal ego certainly desires assurance that some marvellous arrangement in the heavens will ultimately bring him to his heart's desire. This is the escalator theory of progress. But there is another part of the mind of man which hungers, not for a specific plan, but for the self-induced struggle and strife which evolution involves. The Theosophical student is sometimes inclined to hope that Masters of Wisdom have knowledge of a scheme or plan which will make everything come out all right in the end. On this view, if one believes his teacher, he is safe and will reach the fulfilment he seeks. But at the same time, there is the autonomous desire *to know for one's self*. If divinity is within, there is no final attainment and therefore no fixed scheme. Further, the "divine urge" towards autonomous thinking can never be assuaged by faith and belief. Instead, the "scheme" is always unfolding, and that doctrine which represents the idea of purpose on one day may be rewritten on the next.

A passage from *The Key to Theosophy,* headed "Fundamental Teachings," suggests the distinction between a "plan" which is thought of as existing in the mind of a Creator and the "Deity" of the Theosophists of every age. Madame Blavatsky writes:

> Our Deity is the eternal, incessantly *evolving,* not *creating,* builder of the universe; that *universe itself unfolding* out of its own essence, not being *made.* It is a sphere, without circumference, in its symbolism, which has but one ever-acting attribute embracing all other existing or thinkable attributes—ITSELF. It is the one law, giving the impulse to manifested, eternal, and immutable laws, within that never-manifesting, *because* absolute LAW, which in its manifesting periods is *The ever-Becoming.*

The architects of the "scheme of evolution," then, are *all* degrees of life and intelligence. Each, identified with the monadic potential, is to some degree creative and regenerative—so the "plan" *itself* evolves. That which is unchanging is not a plan nor in relation to a plan, but manifests its presence through the eternal necessity of interdependence. The "Laws of Nature" and the "karma" of man are a description of interdependence provided by the interwoven patterns of an expanding growth. So any "plan" or "scheme" is merely a description of the patterns assumed by the movements of life. But these blueprints belong to those who originate them or to God: they are not representative of that in man which is changeless because it is formless and schemeless, nor are they representative of that in man which is always the potential creator of new orientations. A passage from Lafcadio Hearn's *Gleanings in Buddha Fields* illustrates the great paradox—the permanence of all impermanence during endless periods of manifestation:

> The Karma-Ego we call Self is mind and is body; both perpetually decay; both are perpetually renewed. From the unknown beginning, this double-phenomenon, objective and subjective, has been alternately dissolved and integrated: each integration is a birth; each dissolution a death. There is no other birth or death but the birth and death of Karma in some form or condition. But at each rebirth the reintegration is never the reintegration of the identical phenomenon, but of another to which it gives rise, as growth begets growth, as motion produces motion.

PROEM

VIII

EMANATION is a doctrine—mystic beyond compare. It embraces the true idea of "evolution" and the true idea of "creation"—the function of Deity. It is the expression of Hierarchies of beings of every grade of Intelligence and Consciousness and Energy, Force, or Power, in all the Kingdoms of Nature, visible and invisible. The mystery of the Universe is locked up in the Hierarchies of Being.

The "idea" of emanation has a mystic quality that compellingly draws the mind to focus on the *source* of the emanation. The source may not be explicit, the focus of the mind may not be deliberate, but there is innate awareness that *apart from its source* an emanation, whatever its nature, is—philosophically—unthinkable.

What is fragrance? tone or texture? flavor? color? sound? Each is the property, quality, or attribute of "something." The nature of that *something* or SUBSTANCE, when understood, results in an ultimate realization: the *essential identity of natures.*

Another thought intrinsic to the idea of Emanation is *Unity in diversity*—for which Nature richly provides examples, although the human mind tends to overlook the underlying unity, since it regards as "nature" the material universe which is the field of experience of the corporeal senses. Whereas, *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 277-8) teaches:

> Nature is an emanation from, and thus an aspect (on the manifested plane) of the ABSOLUTE consciousness.
>
> Nature is in reality the aggregate of forces manipulated by semi-intelligent beings (elementals) guided by High Planetary Spirits (Dhyan Chohans), whose collective aggregate forms the manifested *verbum* of the unmanifested LOGOS, and constitutes at one and the same time the MIND of the Universe and its immutable LAW.

All of this is implicit in the "emanation of the Word" referred to in the opening lines of the Proem as synonymous with the "re-awakening of still slumbering Energy"—symbolized by the Point. This simile suggesting human speech turns the mind inward to the steps involved in the process. The uttered sound is preceded by an occult or hidden, initiating movement—unknown, unseen, unsuspected. Thought precedes the spoken word, ideas precede thought, and at the root of thought is the Power to think made active by the universally present energy, the power of Will. Stanzas III and IV from the Book of Dzyan deal with this period in the Universal Evolutionary process:

Stanza III. describes the Re-awakening of the Universe to life after Pralaya. It depicts the emergence of the "Monads" from their state of absorption within the ONE; the earliest and highest stage in the formation of "Worlds," the term Monad being one which may apply equally to the vastest Solar System or the tiniest atom.

Stanza IV. shows the differentiation of the "Germ" of the Universe into the septenary hierarchy of conscious Divine Powers, who are the active manifestations of the One Supreme Energy. They are the framers, shapers, and ultimately the creators of all the manifested Universe, in the only sense in which the name "Creator" is intelligible; they inform and guide it; they are the intelligent Beings who adjust and control evolution, embodying in themselves those manifestations of the ONE LAW, which we know as "The Laws of Nature."

Generically, they are known as the Dhyan Chohans, though each of the various groups has its own designation in the Secret Doctrine.

This stage of evolution is spoken of in Hindu mythology as the "Creation" of the Gods. (*S.D.* I, 21-22.)

Concerning Emanation, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says, in part:

Emanation (Lat. *emanatio,* from *e-,* out, *manare,* to flow), in philosophy and theology, the name of one of the three chief theories of existence, *i.e.,* of the relation between God and men—the One and the many, the Universal and the Particular. This theory has been propounded in many forms, but the central idea is that the universe of individuals consists of the involuntary "outpourings" of the ultimate divine essence. That essence is not only all-inclusive, but absolutely perfect, while the "emanated" individuals degenerate in proportion to the degree of their distance from the essence. . . . The emanation theory is to be contrasted with the theory of evolution. The two theories are alike in so far as both recognize the existence of individuals as due to a necessary process of differentiation and a scale of existence. They differ, however, fundamentally in this respect, that, whereas evolution regards the process as from the indeterminate lower to the determinate higher, emanation regards it as from the highest to the indefinitely lower.

H.P.B. herself said: "The day *may* come when the 'Natural Selection,' as taught by Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer, will form only a *part,* in its ultimate modification, of our Eastern doctrine of Evolution, which will be Manu and Kapila *esoterically explained.* The Emanationist believes that nothing can be evolved—or, as the word means, unwombed or born—except it has first been involved, thus indicating that life is from a spiritual potency above the whole."

The *Britannica* continues:

> The theory of emanation which had its source in certain moral and religious ideas, aims first of all at explaining the origin of mental and spiritual existence as an effluence from the divine and absolute spirit. In the next place, it seeks to account for the general laws of the world, for the universal forms of existence, as ideas which emanate from the Deity. By some it was developed into a complete philosophy of the world, in which matter itself is viewed as the lowest emanation from the absolute.

Emanation is a word of *movement.* In the *cycle of emanations,* "the lower orders before they develop into higher ones must emanate from the higher spiritual ones, and when arrived at the turning-point, be absorbed again into the infinite." The "turning-point" has universal application. H.P.B. says, in a footnote (*S.D.* I, 586), that "Every well-read Occultist knows that the *seventh* and *fourth* members—whether in a septenary chain of worlds, the septenary hierarchy of angels, or in the constitution of man, animal, plant, or mineral atom—that the *seventh* and *fourth* members in the geometrically and mathematically uniform workings of the immutable laws of Nature, always play a distinct and specific part in the septenary system . . ." And again, speaking of the septenary chain of Globes (*S.D.* I, 182): "The fourth member of a series occupies a unique position. Unlike the others, the Fourth has no 'sister' Globe on the same plane as itself, and it thus forms the fulcrum of the 'balance' represented by the whole chain. It is the sphere of final evolutionary adjustments, the world of Karmic scales, the Hall of Justice, where the balance is struck which determines the future course of the Monad during the remainder of its incarnations in the cycle." And Wm. Q. Judge, in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* speaks of the fourth principle as the "balance principle of the whole seven." He continues: "This fourth principle is like the sign Libra in the path of the Sun through the Zodiac; when the Sun (who is the real man) reaches that sign he trembles in the balance. Should he go back the worlds would be destroyed; he goes onward, and the whole human race is lifted up to perfection."

Individuality is the characteristic of the respective Hierarchies, not of their units. Separativeness, or "unit-awareness" is characteristic only of the human Kingdom—a temporary phase in the cycle of evolution. Excessive separativeness is marked by "pride and self-regard" and is often mistaken for Individuality. To correct this false notion, and to "point the Way," *The Voice of the Silence* says:

> Tell him, O Candidate, that he who makes of pride and self-regard bond-maidens to devotion; that he, who cleaving to existence, still lays his patience and submission to the Law, as a sweet flower at the feet of Shakya-Thub-pa, becomes a Srotapatti in this birth. The Siddhis of perfection may loom far, far away; but the first step is taken, the stream is entered, and he may gain the eye-sight of the mountain eagle, the hearing of the timid doe. . . .
>
> Be of good cheer, Disciple; bear in mind the golden rule. Once thou hast passed the gate Srotapatti, "he who the stream hath entered"; once thy foot hath pressed the bed of the Nirvanic stream in this or any future life; thou hast but seven other births before thee, O thou of adamantine Will.

The nearer to the region of Homogeneity and the One, the purer and the less accentuated that individuality in the Hierarchy. This is perhaps why it is said, in *Light on the Path*: "And that power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men."

Man being a compound of the essences of all those celestial Hierarchies may succeed in making himself, as such, superior, in one sense, to any hierarchy or class, or even combination of them. By paralyzing his lower personality, and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the *non-separateness* of his higher SELF from the One absolute SELF, man can, even during his terrestrial life, become like one of the Dhyanis; and "once on *their* plane the Spirit of Solidarity and perfect Harmony, which reigns in every Hierarchy, must extend over him and protect him in every particular." (*S.D.* I, 276.)

Solidarity is the working basis of Brotherhood, a "unity" which the lowest intelligences cannot avoid, and which the highest Intelligences consciously embody because they are "constitutionally incapable" of acting against the good of the Whole.

Speaking of the *Logos,* as both the unmanifested and the manifested WORD, H.P.B. quotes the Occultists (*S.D.* I, 573): "This highest consciousness is only a *synthetic* unit in the world of the manifested Logos —or on the *plane of illusion;* for it is the sum total of Dhyan-Chohanic *consciousnesses.*"

At every level of consciousness the effects of "Solidarity" are manifest or experienced. First of all, perhaps, in the orderly process of emanation—"a series of effluxes." How is *order* preserved? in the "music of the spheres"? the methodical working of instinct? the seasonal, and the time-ly occurrences of events? the moral compulsion to "keep

one's word"? Through the interdependence of relationships during Manvantaric manifestation. Facets of this fundamental idea are found in every phase of the Philosophy of Theosophy. In *The Ocean of Theosophy,* Wm. Q. Judge offers this quotation from a Master's letter:

> Nature consciously prefers that matter should be indestructible in organic rather than in inorganic forms, and works slowly but incessantly towards the realization of this object—the evolution of conscious life out of inert material.

And in *The Bhagavad-Gita* is the mantramic statement of Krishna: "The wise man also seeketh for that which is homogeneous with his own nature."

Subtly, but in very basic fashion, as the Second and Third Fundamental Propositions show, TIME is implicated in every movement of Consciousness, every expression of Intelligence. H.P.B. says elsewhere that it is "energy; the substance of the world, its soul, the all-permeant 'Sarvaga,' in conjunction with *Kala* 'time.' The three are the trinity in one, during Manvantara, the all-potential Unity, which acts on the plane of illusion (Maya) as three distinct things."

Kala has the meaning of time, also "fate" and a "cycle." All three meanings would pertain to the "Cycle of Necessity," the conditioned aspect of Time, and the "pilgrimage" in accordance *with Cyclic and Karmic law,* "during the whole term." And particularly pertinent in this context are three of the *Aphorisms on Karma*: ". . . he who knows what is the ultimate division of time in this Universe knows Karma"; "The Karma of this earth is the combination of the acts and thoughts of all beings of every grade which were concerned in the preceding Manvantara or evolutionary stream from which ours flows"; "Karma is an undeviating and unerring tendency in the Universe to restore equilibrium, and it operates incessantly."

The "trinity" can confuse the orthodox mind, and make the conception of Deity as "an absolute Unity" forever incomprehensible. But to the intuitive mind, familiar illustrations in the impersonal framework of Nature furnish a field of comprehensibility wherein the mind is enabled to be "at home" with the idea of Deity. The nature of the Soul demands that it learn at last to *dwell* in the *knowledge* of the Presence and omnipresence of Deity. To awaken to this consciousness is the first significant need of the human mind, H.P.B. indicates:

> "If thou wouldest believe in the Power which acts within the root of a plant, or imagine the root concealed under the soil, thou hast to think of its stalk or trunk and of its leaves and flowers. Thou canst not imagine that Power independently of these objects. Life can be known only by the Tree of Life . . ." (Precepts for Yoga). The idea of *Absolute* Unity would be broken entirely in our conception, had we not something concrete before our eyes to contain that Unity. And the deity being absolute, must be omnipresent, hence not an atom but contains IT within itself. The roots, the trunk and its many branches are three distinct objects, yet they are one tree. . . . (*S.D.* I, 58-59.)

The *union* of the three principles "depends upon a fourth—the LIFE which radiates from the summits of the Unreachable, to become an universally diffused Essence on the manifested planes of Existence." There are always the three hypostases or aspects of the manifesting Spirit—of that which "does not perish with created things."

The imagery of the Tree of Life is the subject of the Fifteenth Chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita*: "The Ashwattha, the eternal sacred tree, grows with its roots above and its branches below, and the leaves of which are the *Vedas;* he who knows this knows the *Vedas.*"

Unity and *Synthesis* are vital aspects of the doctrine of Emanation. In his portion of *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* Robert Crosbie amplifies the idea of Unity as symbolized by the *Ashwattha,* and with characteristic simplicity presents an important idea of Synthesis:

> Every form and object is composed of minor forms or expressions of life or consciousness. Our bodies, for instance, are composed of mineral, vegetable and animal lives and substance; these are borrowed from the three kingdoms below us and are returned to them. . . . In every composite form—and all forms are that—there is a synthetic consciousness which has evolved and sustains that form; that synthetic power is unaffected by any changes in the form. In Man *Kutastha,* or "he who standeth on high unaffected," would seem to indicate the Divine Ego, whose divinity and spiritual nature remain as such through all forms and changes.

Knowledge *emanates* from Knowers and is never lost; though periodically obscured, it ever remains the "uninterrupted record" of wisdom garnered by the sages and the seers of the Past. Each representation of the Archaic Wisdom, in Symbol-form or doctrine, touching the *heart* of man, will—by so much—help to bring about a spiritual renaissance, a Universal Brotherhood, for the same HEART beats in every Being throughout the Universe.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

THERE are probably many who wish they could do more to further the work of the Movement than they are presently doing, especially when they consider how few working Theosophists there are to promulgate this philosophy which the world so sorely needs. Some of those who keenly sense this relative paucity of workers have wondered if they should go out and form new study groups, but have hesitated to do so, fearing that there is some subtle moral impropriety in such "missionary work." Is this hesitancy justified, or is it merely being overcautious?

It is difficult to answer a question "from the Theosophical point of view" when there are few explicit statements on the subject to be found in the teachings. In a general way, of course, the great hope of the teacher was that Theosophy would flourish in the world, and that Theosophical centers would naturally spring up, by a sort of spontaneous generation. Perhaps, though, these two words, "natural" and "spontaneous," contain a key to the problem. We know that Krishna, in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* exhorts man to engage only in necessary actions, and surely what is necessary to the proper working of the Law must be, in the deepest sense, natural. Therefore, if a person feels hesitant and unnatural about going out to proselyte "officially," one might infer that his intuitions are correct, no matter what his intellect may say about the necessity for gaining more workers. The work done by students for the benefit of the Movement is not to be measured in foot-pounds.

A small Theosophical pamphlet makes the statement, "The sum of the individual adhesions makes the cohesive body. . . . Hence the work of the Parent Lodge has never been in the direction of establishing new Lodges or a Society of any kind, for the sake of mere numbers . . ." At one time, as we know, there were probably more people who were referred to as Theosophists than there are at present. At the turn of the century, for example, there were scores of "Theosophical" sects, which attracted large numbers of people. Yet despite the great variety of organizations, or more probably because of it, the message of Theosophy was nearly lost to the world. This period of darkness in the history of the Movement had many causes, but perhaps the most fundamental was the lack of internal cohesiveness, of adhesion on the part of each

individual to the teachings pure and simple. It seems, almost paradoxically, that only when the individual asserts his own sense of responsibility and self-reliance can groups of people become organically cohesive. A group of such individuals, united solely by a common aim, purpose and teaching, becomes a living thing, capable of growth, like a plant whose separate roots penetrate one soil. And it *will grow*—naturally, inevitably, attracting to itself those elements which it needs, and which need it; for the Law does work, and those who are ready for Theosophy will find it. Nothing can stop them from finding it.

This does not mean that new Lodges should not be formed, but they should be formed from "necessity," and so, in a real sense, form themselves—that is, arise out of a specific need felt by the individuals of a specific locality. It would be easy enough to send out official "missionaries" to form Lodges, but groups cannot be sustained without the will to study in members. Since the sustaining elements must come from the local inhabitants, they must participate in the impulse. Certainly a group run by missionaries for missionaries would die like a plant without roots, a city in the sky.

To pursue the simile further, Theosophical ideas are circulating all the time, and will grow where the soil is ready, whether there is someone to "plant" them or not. For example, one ULT study group, later to become a Lodge, actually came into being without any contact with Theosophists of any other Lodge, the only basis being a reading of the Magazine THEOSOPHY and a familiarity with the ULT Declaration. A hybrid started by some traveling organizer will seldom have the vigor and staying power of such a spontaneous local impulse.

This certainly does not imply that the idea of forming a study group might not come from some other source, perhaps as a suggestion from the Parent Lodge. But it is only a suggestion. The *decision* to start such a group must be made by those who intend to sustain it with all their energy, perhaps for all their life. It is only such a determination that can afford the ground from which a strong and truly "natural" Lodge can spring. In the conclusion of *The Key to Theosophy,* H.P.B. states the situation quite plainly: "The future of the Theosophical Movement will depend almost entirely upon the degree of selflessness, earnestness, devotion, and last, but not least, on the amount of knowledge and wisdom possessed by those members, on whom it will fall to carry on the work."

BY THE WAY OF IDEA

IDEAS, such as are rooted in Principles, are *eternal,* and, therefore, exist forever. So the ABSOLUTE, the ever-unborn, ceaselessly and periodically expressing itself without diminution—remains in Eternal Duration, indestructible, though all forms and potencies give way in time, one to another. As so commonly heard and repeated, "There is no (essential) new thing under the sun."

Ideas do not exist of themselves, though, as no "thing" exists of itself. For something to exist, three things are required: a perceptive consciousness, known theosophically as the Perceiver; the object to be perceived or evaluated; and a resulting "something" gained by the Perceiver, or Soul.

Ideas may thus be seen to be associated with beings, as beings are themselves related to THAT which is Infinite. And the SELF, even though itself inexhaustible, is ever beyond the power of complete comprehension by the Seer.

Ideas exist forever as ideal abstractions on the highest plane, to be brought, during objective manifestation, into as perfect a harmonizing correspondence of Man's advancement as his evolving intelligence permits. No idea, therefore, should be out of place—everything in Nature having its rightful position in coadunition with all other units. But when man, the lower entity, or Kama-Manas, upsets the natural balance (for which he suffers karmically under the law of his own Power of Egoity) discord and dissonance set in and the whole order of Nature reflects the imbalance until readjustment occurs.

Ideas that truly reflect the highest plane of Unity must find their ultimate justification through the instrumentality of Man who, it is held, represents the embodiment of Nature's grandest scheme. Toward this gravitate the countless hierarchical intelligences in perfection of form, integration of function and communication. That, of course, is why we must labor to bring about a true alignment of all the forces of Nature.

UNIVERSAL ETHICS

THE numerous systems of ethics formulated for man's guidance throughout the ages are practically identical in character. This similarity of precept, according to Theosophy, proceeds from the fact that all the Divine Teachers of mankind were representatives of one great "Fraternity." Periodically, it is held, attempts are made by these Elder Brothers to imbue mankind with the basic principles of right action, through the practice of which they themselves attained their own high state of knowledge and power.

In most of the scriptures of the world, there is some recording of a great event in the course of human evolution—when the "Sons of Light" descended on earth and incarnated among men, imparting to the race something of their own divine essence. Evidence of this event is found, however distorted, in the Christian teaching of the Fallen Angels, and also in the Old Testament reference to the Serpent (a name almost universally applied to the Wise Ones), through whose instigation man did eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. In Zoroastrian lore, the same story is depicted in the descent of the *Amshaspends,* the duality that resulted, and the terrible conflict which thenceforth ensued between Ahura Mazda—man's Higher Self—and Ahriman, the lower. Perhaps nowhere is the story more vividly told than in the myth of Prometheus, who descended on earth and endowed man with the light of Mind—foreseeing, as he did, his own consequent involvement in matter and the struggle which would ensue between the lower material forces and his own godlike nature. In full knowledge of the consequences, Prometheus took upon himself the struggle in order to make it possible for man to share in the immortality of Spirit. Zeus, who, according to legend, condemned Prometheus to be bound to a rock and tormented by vultures, is held to be the symbolic representation of the forces of man's material nature—which bind him to the rock of matter, tormented on the one hand by unsatisfied personal desires, and on the other by conscience, which notes the disharmony that ensues from attempted gratification of the lower appetites. How long must Prometheus remain bound to the rock of matter? How long must man wander, like the prodigal son, in the foreign, unfriendly land? He will remain bound, deprived of his spiritual birthright, just so long perhaps as he refuses to recognize and assume his divine nature, and to heed the laws

of right action which the Teachers have sought to inculcate from the beginning of time.

At the time of the incarnation of the Sons of Light, the great truths concerning man's inherent divinity and ultimate perfectibility were impacted in the center of his being. If these truths are not known and regarded, it can only mean that the thinker's preoccupation with the illusions of matter has so clouded his vision that the life of soul is almost completely obscured. The present task for each individual is to reawaken the *manasic fire,* to perform such acts of sacrifice and morality as will lead to the rediscovery of the Self.

The story of the struggle for freedom is portrayed in the legend of the Minotaur, in which Theseus fights the monster, and in slaying him helps to liberate his fellows from the ominous fate which hovered over them. If the idea of one individual helping to liberate others seems like vicarious atonement, it should be remembered that, in the eyes of Masters, mankind is one indivisible Whole, and that whatever affects one affects every other, through the indestructible law of solidarity. Each individual, it is true, must fight his own battles, but is it not also true that success on the part of one makes it easier for others to achieve? The man of right action imparts a beneficent influence to the whole of life; he who fails to live up to the best he knows becomes an obstacle in the way of others.

Universal Brotherhood—the Unity of all life—is the fundamental tenet in the world's religious lore. "If ye do it unto the least of these," said Jesus, "ye do it unto me." In *The Bhagavad-Gita,* Krishna says to his disciple: "He, O Arjuna, who by the similitude found in himself seeth but one essence in all things whether they be evil or good, is considered to be the most excellent devotee." Reverence for all life, among the ancient Fire-Philosophers, grew out of Zoroaster's teaching of a *living Nature.* The central theme of Zoroastrian ethics is Purity (right thought and feeling), through which not only subjugation of the lower forces in man himself may be achieved, but also the elevation of the elements of Great Nature as well, which human beings contact through their bodily instruments. Good thoughts, good words and good deeds, embody the Law of Ahura Mazda: the scriptures of all peoples are rich in metaphor, in which man, as the sower of right thought and action, finally reaps the harvest which enables him to feed the hungry with the bread of life.

Perhaps the most important thing for men to learn, and seemingly the most difficult, is that realization of happiness must be sought within themselves. "The kingdom of God is within you," said Jesus; "Be happy and contented in the Self, through the Self," teaches the *Gita;* and in the *Upanishads* there is the verse: "Who knows the Soul and knows himself as It, what shall he long for?" But few individuals, unfortunately, know the Soul; nor do they know themselves as It. In outward seeking and desiring, men stimulate in themselves the feeling of separateness, not only from their fellow-men but from the whole of manifested life. It is man's ignorance of his own essential nature that the teachers of all times have attempted to remove. Ever pointing to the unity of life, they encourage men to restrain outward desire, to subdue the outward tendencies of mind, and to turn thoughts *within,* toward oneness.

Is it not a fundamental law of the Christian code that men should "love one another," being enjoined: "Do unto others as you would have done unto you"? Does not St. Paul indicate the paramount importance of Charity, without which all the other virtues are said to be as sounding brass? On being asked. "Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all one's life?" Confucius said: "Is not RECIPROCITY such a word? What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others." And in the *Gita,* referring to the law of reciprocity, Krishna says: "Let this be to you Kamaduk, the cow of plenty, on which ye shall depend for the accomplishment of all your wishes. With this, nourish the Gods, that the gods may nourish you; thus mutually nourishing ye shall obtain the highest felicity."

In the Christian Catechism, man's purpose is held to be—"To know God, to love him, to serve him and be happy with him in this world and the next." A comparable statement is found in the third chapter of the *Gita*: "All actions performed other than as sacrifice unto God make the actor bound by action." In the Catechism, the path of right action is obscured, unfortunately, by the theological misinterpretation of God as a personal, outside being. In the *Gita,* on the other hand, the same injunction is given, but supported by a knowledge of the Self *within,* the key to true ethical or moral action, which alone is said to be without risk.

True religion begins, according to Theosophy, with the awareness of the reality of all men as souls—fundamentally identical—and one in essence with the Unknown Root, or God. Throughout the *Gita,* the devotee is reminded of the presence in himself, and in all men, of the

unmodifiable spirit—that impersonal center in man's being which is spectator of all the changes within the lower nature. When the position of the impersonal Self is assumed, the separative actions of the personality become as reprehensible to the perceiver as to those who suffer from them. Then will animosity and antagonism abate of themselves.

"There is no purifier in this world," according to Krishna, "to be compared to spiritual knowledge, and he who is perfected in devotion finds spiritual knowledge springing up spontaneously in himself in the progress of time." That such knowledge may be acquired by any man is the promise of the Master to those who diligently inquire after it, and who attend to the behests of the Spirit. An example of such devotion is recorded in the Taoist story of The Gardener:

> Tzu Kung, a disciple of Confucius who secretly aspired to be a teacher of men, in passing through a small village noticed an old man engaged in making a ditch to connect his vegetable garden with a well. He had a pitcher in his hand with which he was bringing up water and pouring it into the ditch, exerting considerable effort.
>
> If you had a machine here, cried Tzu Kung, in a day you could irrigate a hundred times your present area. Would you not like to have one?
>
> What is it, asked the gardener.
>
> It is a contrivance made of wood, heavy behind and light in front. It draws up water as you do with your hand but in a constantly overflowing stream. It is called a well-sweep.
>
> Thereupon the gardener flushed and said: I have heard from my teacher that those who have cunning implements are cunning in their dealings and that those who are cunning in their dealings have cunning in their hearts, and that those who have cunning in their hearts cannot be pure and incorrupt, and that those who are not pure and incorrupt are restless in spirit, and that those who are restless in spirit are no fit vehicles for Tao. It is not that I do not know these things. I should be ashamed to use them.
>
> At this Tzu Kung was much abashed and said nothing. Then the gardener asked him who he was and Tzu Kung replied that he was a disciple of Confucius.
>
> The gardener then said: Are you not one who extends his knowledge with a view to putting yourself above the rest of mankind; who plays in a key to which no one can sing so as to spread his reputation abroad? Rather become unconscious of self and you will be near. Begone. Do not interrupt my work.
>
> Tzu Kung changed color and slunk away, being not at all pleased with this rebuff. He had travelled some distance before he recovered his usual appearance.

> What did the man we met do, asked a disciple, that you should change color and not recover for such a long time?
>
> To which Tzu Kung replied: I did not know there was such a man. Aiming at Tao he perfects his virtue. By perfecting his virtue he perfects his body, and by perfecting his body he perfects his spiritual part. And the perfection of the spiritual part is the Tao of the Sage. Success, profit, skill—these have no place in his heart. Such a man, if he does not will it, he does not stir; if he does not wish it, he does not act. If all the world praises him, he does not heed. If all the world blames him, he does not repine. The praise and the blame of the world neither advantage him nor otherwise. He may be called a man of perfect virtue. As for me, I am but a mere creature of impulse.

The story is surely not intended to belittle the uses of labor-saving machinery, but to point to the possibility of the acquirement of knowledge for even the simplest of men, and to show that success, profit and skill, of themselves, contribute little toward the goal of union with Tao, or the Self.

There is no more encouraging aspect in the teachings of the Wisdom Religion than that implied in the law of Cycles, or Karma—the teaching that whatever condition one may find himself in, he has created it himself, and that the intensity of joy or sorrow is but a reflection of the energy put into the original cause. Through extremes of thought, will and feeling, men almost invariably magnify or intensify whatever they do. "Who is there," asks Lao Tze, "that can make muddy water clear?" But if allowed to remain still, it will gradually clear of itself. Be sparing of speech and things will come right of themselves. If men would cease to set up inharmonious causes, the conditions of life would eventually right themselves. The impermanence of all conditions and the transitory nature of all experience leads one to appreciate the words of William Q. Judge: "The past. What is it? Nothing. You are the past of yourself. I care not what I was yesterday—I care only what I am this moment. And as we use the moment, we shift the future up or down."

The most familiar statement of the Law of Karma in Christian scriptures, perhaps, is that attributed to St. Paul: "As ye sow, so shall ye also reap." In the *Gita,* a corresponding statement is found in Krishna's words. "Those who worship the gods go to the gods, and those who worship me come unto me"—the term *gods,* in this case, referring no doubt to the gods of sense, or other forms of personal gratification. In *Tao Teh King,* Lao Tze holds: "He who acts in accordance with Tao, becomes one with Tao. He who treads the path of virtue becomes one

with virtue. He who pursues a course of vice becomes one with vice. The man who is one with Tao, Tao is glad to receive. The man who is one with Virtue, Virtue is also glad to receive. The man who is one with Vice, Vice is also glad to receive."

"All paths," says Krishna, "lead to me"—which is evidently intended to imply that the ethics of all religions and all nations are identical in essence, and that, whether one guides his footsteps by the straight and narrow path exemplified in the Sermon on the Mount or by *The Bhagavad-Gita,* whether he follows the paradoxical way of *Tao Teh King* or the Noble Eightfold Path set forth in *The Light of Asia*—the goal is one for all.

Reason and Virtue

Men who are governed by reason desire nothing for themselves which they do not also desire for the rest of mankind. The greatest good of those who follow virtue is common to all, and all can equally enjoy it.

He who lives under the guidance of reason endeavors as much as possible to repay his fellow's hatred, rage, contempt, with love and nobleness.

Hatred can never be good. He who wishes to revenge injuries by reciprocal hatred will live in misery. But he who endeavors to drive away hatred by means of love, fights with pleasure and confidence: he resists equally one or many men, and scarcely needs at all the help of fortune. Those whom he conquers yield joyfully, not from failure but through the increase of their powers.

A free man thinks of nothing less than of death, but his wisdom is a meditation not of death but of life.

A free man never acts by fraud, but always with good faith.

Only free men are truly grateful one to the other. A free man, who lives among ignorant people, tries as much as he can to refuse their benefits.

—Baruch de Spinoza

ON THE LOOKOUT

Unitarian-Universalist Discussion

During the past ten years, Lookout has noted the consolidation of the Universalists and Unitarians and the trend of these groups away from Christian sectarianism and toward Theosophical perspectives. An instance was the deletion of the adjective "Christian" from the Unitarian publication, formerly the *Christian Register,* which later merged with the *Universalist Leader* under a strictly nondenominational heading. These changes could not have taken place without continuous ferment of discussion leading toward a kind of Emersonian liberalism, and the content of the *Register-Leader* has for a long time evidenced such thinking.

Recently another proposal is receiving consideration—the elimination of both the words "Unitarian" and "Universalist" and the substitution of the phrase "The Liberal Church of America." Discussion of this proposed change in the Editors' Forum (*Register-Leader,* June) raise some points of natural interest to Theosophical students.

Can a "Church" Be Truly "Liberal"?

A portion of the editorial reads as follows:

> The proposed change in name of our denomination to "The Liberal Church of America" opens up an interesting speculation. Can an institution at once be both liberal and a church, or are these two poles between which it moves; at one time to be liberal, at another time a church?
>
> Liberalism, if it is to be anything more than a degree of something; if it is to be thought of as having a definite character, must be a fluidity, a condition of freedom, allowing room for unlimited varieties of beliefs; a condition of searching and growth. A church, if it is to be anything within hawg-calling distance of its generally accepted nature (and it had better be, because we have inherited institutions and expectations), must be an activity of, an offering of opportunity for worship. The primary function, the distinguishing character of a church is worship. Worship requires commitment, if only for the moment of worship; an end to searching, a finding, if only for the moment. To be liberal is to doubt; to be a church is to believe.

A Theosophical Dilemma? ?

Students of H. P. Blavatsky's *Key to Theosophy* are led to see the

need for balance between mere eclecticism and conviction that a *universal* Wisdom Religion exists. Many students of H.P.B.'s time were enthusiastic proponents of the importance of the comparative study of ancient and modern doctrines, but the second object of the Society was never considered as an end in itself—rather an opportunity for distilling fundamental philosophical truths leading towards a unity of "aim, purpose and teaching." Those who became devotees of H.P.B.'s Theosophy subsequently *seemed,* to many, by the very intensity of their conviction, to have deserted liberalism. A similar problem confronted the philosophically inclined supporters of "The Liberal Church of America," for they too have an inclination to "devotion" and "belief" along with the realization that the best beliefs cannot be closed or fixed. The editorial continues:

> A denomination can be liberal, maintaining a climate in which churches of differing religious references can fellowship and work together. The Unitarian Universalist Association is such, as the American Unitarian Association and The Universalist Church of America were before it. A local congregation can be liberal, allowing room, engaging its members in searching; forcing no agreement. But can they worship together? Conceivably they can, if members are committed, for that moment, each to his own findings. Then each, in tolerance and respect for each other, can make the common experience serve his faith. But, if the liberal condition of the local group and of the association is to be valid, and not just a temporary freedom until one belief or another can gain a balance of power, the individual member must himself be liberal. And, if he is, how can he worship?
>
> Is it possible for a person to search and find and keep on searching? to be complete but not finished? Is it possible in a person for doubt to walk with faith? This is the dilemma of the liberal churchman. The world is not perfect; work in progress causes constant inconvenience, doubting. We become heirs to doubting by the same legacy that gives us hope; we cannot get rid of one without losing the other. Because we can doubt, we can hope. Because we doubt, our faith is not an animal-like innocence, but a creative striving.

Health and Therapy—Current Items

From time to time, Lookout will note items which have been collecting in the files under the heading of Medicine, Drugs, Immunization, etc., and it might be a good idea to jot down these volume and page references in a copy of the *Health and Therapy* pamphlet. One source of well-documented material is John Lear's Science column in the

Saturday Review. In the March 3 issue, for example, Mr. Lear discusses the pressure advertising which is more prevalent in the drug trade, perhaps, than in any other. In "The Struggle for Control of Drug Prescriptions," he reports data brought out in Senator Kefauver's two-and-a-half year drug inquiry. A case of interest is that of Dr. Arthur Sackler who, with his two brothers (all psychiatrists) owned and operated the Glutavite Company. In addition, Dr. Sackler is chairman of the board of the large advertising firm (Adams) which handles most of the company's advertising; is one of the founders of the medical journal (*Medical Tribune*) in which the Glutavite ads most frequently appear; and owns outright an organization which "serviced editorially" the *Medical Tribune.*

Fantasy—and Facts

Glutavite ads appearing in Dr. Sackler's magazine (the *Journal* of the American Medical Association declined to publish them) ballyhooed the "drug" as a "metabolic cerebral tonic" especially helpful for confused minds, particularly in the aged. Its various polysyllabic "essential elements," when "broken down into ordinary layman's English," mean simply that it is composed of a familiar meat flavoring (Glutavite) plus vitamin B. Regarding the ethics of this sort of thing, Mr. Lear observes:

> The spectacle of three psychiatrists, members of a profession looked to with almost awesome respect for guidance in mental illness, concertedly pushing a flavoring extract mixed with vitamins as a means of arresting the pitiable deterioration of aging minds, is a painful experience. But the l-Glutavite episode has a significance beyond the compass of psychiatry. It illustrates the machine-like disregard of individuality into which the once precise art of prescription drug administration has descended in America.

Obligations of Press, Radio, and TV Commentators

"Many similar instances," says Mr. Lear, "were entered a month ago in the transcript of the closing days of the Kefauver hearing." He concludes:

> Every conscientious newspaperman, radio and TV commentator, every science writer of any sort, has an obligation to read the testimony, study the supporting documents, and thus prepare himself to find the few straws of truth in the torrent of drug propaganda that pours over editorial desks everywhere—canned editorials, picture mats with cap-

tions written to make trade names of drugs, "outlines" and "drafts" of articles, "backgrounders for your confidential use," "help" for free lance magazine writers who "want to check their facts," interviews conducted by publicity men and handed in to city desks in the guise of objective pieces of reporting, even samples of new prescription drugs with publicity men's advice on dosage: a clear violation of medical ethics.

As science steadily changes the environment on which man depends, the integrity of information and the channels of its communication grow more and more imperative. In the marketplace, the buyer must always beware. But the new drug law that is coming up in Congress ought to draw some lines around what we must be aware of.

ANOTHER WARNING

The prolific use of chemical additives in foods in order to "make them look, taste or feel better," was assailed by a team of leading specialists (New York *Times,* April 4) who "recommended a major expansion of the Federal Government's food-surveillance activities." The team reported:

There are no harmless substances; there are only harmless ways of using substances. The goal of the proposed surveillance and research program would be to see that additives are kept at safe levels. . . .

Nevertheless, the nation cannot turn the clock back and eliminate the use of chemicals, even if it is wished. They have become such a prop to food production that, if they were withdrawn, near famine would ensue.

Deleterious side-effects have caused a drug widely used for lowering blood cholesterol level to be withdrawn from the market. An article in the New York *Herald Tribune* for April 17 states:

After several months of usage, talk of side effects began spreading through professional circles. Reports were published of itchiness, skin blemishes, falling hair, nausea, vomiting and temporary vaginal bleeding.

At the Mayo Clinic, the staff discussed the possibility that the drug could cause cataracts, but these reports, on four cases, were never published.

MEDICAL RE-EVALUATION

In the Los Angeles *Times* for March 15, we find:

Clinical evidence of mental retardation in infants with a prolonged overdosage of vitamin D leads Dr. John Chaffey, of Denver, to question how many morons have been produced in the United States through "vitamin huckstering." He said that selling the public on

widespread vitamin deficiency is "the greatest quackery of 1962."

In almost every large medical center in this country, he said, there are spectacular cases of chronic overdosage. Children, after three months oversupply, become lethargic, lose motor function and finally their mental growth is retarded. He called the onset of symptoms slow and deceptive and with one irreversible effect: The mental retardation remains.

Dr. Chaffey stated that the normal American diet abundantly provides enough vitamin D to supply everyone and the advent of "enriched milk," introduced in the 1930's to prevent rickets, more than supplies the infant with an adequate amount.

Preserving Vested Interests

A significant interview on the general subject of "medicine" was recently published by the Center for Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara. The man selected for extensive questioning in an educational series sponsored by the Fund for the Republic of the Ford Foundation was Dr. Herbert Ratner, well-known medical lecturer and Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health at Loyola University of Chicago, and Director of Health at Oak Park, Ill. In the course of the interview, Ratner points out the immense power of well-organized commercial interests in influencing the policies adopted by the A.M.A. In the case of the introduction of the Salk vaccine, it is clear that the A.M.A. did not wish to commit itself. But what Dr. Ratner calls "a tremendous public relations effort" propagandized the "backwardness" of the A.M.A. on this point, "picturing them to the public as a group so concerned with preserving their vested interests that they were willing to let children go without this vaccine and become paralyzed." Dr. Ratner continues:

The AMA finally capitulated to this pressure and got on the bandwagon. Along with the Advertising Council, legislators, the American Legion, and other groups, it joined with the National Foundation and the Public Health Service in a mass prescription of Salk shots for everybody in the country under 40.

With this decision the American physician was converted into a technician, a pharmacist's mate. He was robbed of his right, his responsibility, his professional judgment. And there were physicians who suffered from this, physicians who refused to use a vaccine they had doubts about—doubts, incidentally, that were later confirmed—and who refused to be pressured or to permit their patients or communities to be pressured by newspaper headlines or mass communication slogans.

Fear Sells Vaccines

At this point the interviewer, Donald McDonald, asked for a recapitulation of the "history" of the Salk vaccine. Dr. Ratner replied:

> Historically, it is difficult to see what happened because the scientific issues were superseded by the public relations factors we have just discussed. Reputations were in jeopardy, and there was concern over the liability for vaccine-induced cases. It was really the nonmedical aspects, particularly the pressure to continue the mass inoculations, that riffled the program from the beginning with expediency, exigency, and experimentation. For example, the initial difficulties encountered in April of 1955 should have been an indication that this vaccine was not "one of the simplest biological preparations to make" as was claimed when it was introduced. Because we wanted to continue the mass inoculations we attributed this immediately, without investigation, to the manufacturing failure of one pharmaceutical firm rather than to the vaccine itself. Then we hopefully and unwittingly went ahead. As time passed, however, we came to see that this vaccine, in the words of the United States Public Health Service, was "one of the most complex biological preparations ever to be made." Similarly, the courts, in exonerating the implicated drug house from negligence, also held that the difficulty was in the recipe and not in its preparation.

Important Lessons to be Learned

All this, says Dr. Ratner, "led to many discussions within scientific circles, [but] unfortunately these discussions have been stifled more often than encouraged." He feels that "there are very important lessons to be learned from this experience, lessons that are in many ways critical to the future of American medicine with its growing concentration of scientific power in the hands of the few, and the uncontrolled growth and influence of voluntary health agencies." "It will be a shame and a setback," he says, "if the lessons are lost." Dr. Ratner continues:

> For one [thing], too many people were caught in an over-commitment to the vaccine right from the beginning: elected government officials from President Eisenhower down, public health officials, newspaper editors, science writers, commentators, and the multiplicity of civic organizations that take pride in rubber-stamping the resolutions that flow from the fountainhead of Science, the new faith. A climate of bias that was not conducive to discussion prevailed. Once committed, no one was eager to admit to himself or to others that he might have been wrong.
>
> Underlying this is the peculiar attitude we have toward health in this country: we cannot conceive of important national agencies being wrong about health—as if truth in health were determined by a majority

count, whether a subsidized count, a bandwagon count, or otherwise. We show none of the wholesome wariness toward health agencies that we have for, say, the people in the Pentagon. But the fact is that if anyone tried to get the Salk vaccine on the market, say, in the spring of 1961, which was six years and 350 million inoculations after its royal birth, it could not have been done because it was such a poor vaccine.

I cannot overemphasize how important it is to the future of medicine that the full account of this major chapter in its history be documented and recorded.

Virus Raises Conjectures

In the *Wall Street Journal* (June 18) Herbert Lawson discusses a virus which has caused much speculation since its isolation. "Viruses," Lawson says, "are tiny bits of infectious matter that invade living cells and reproduce, causing disease." He continues:

The monkey virus generating excitement among researchers is called Simian Virus No. 40. Among the questions surrounding it: Will it help prove that viruses can cause human cancer? If so, should public health authorities be concerned that this virus, and other viruses known to cause cancer in animals, have probably been in vaccines injected into humans?

No one has proven that any virus can cause cancer in humans, but the theory seems promising. In recent experiments with Simian Virus No. 40, scientists found it can cause genetic changes in human tissue in test tubes. The changes, such as unusually rapid and abnormal growth, appear similar to cancerous changes in the body.

Some Specific Tests

Simian Virus No. 40 was first isolated in 1960 in killed polio vaccine. It was found to be tough, resisting the heat and formaldehyde process used to kill the polio virus in vaccine manufacture. Researchers all over the country began making various tests with this virus in order to determine its effect on human tissues. Among them:

Dr. Bernice Eddy of the National Institute of Health found that extracts of some monkey kidney tissue, when injected into hamsters, caused cancerous tumors. Both Marck researchers and Dr. Eddy confirmed the cause of the cancer was Simian Virus No. 40. Since primates are akin to man in so many physiological ways, scientists believed they were on the trail of a virus possibly linked to human cancer.

Several months ago, Dr. John Enders, Harvard Nobel prize-winner, reported on the effect of the monkey virus on human tissue taken from stillborn infants. Such tissue can be kept alive in chemical cultures

> for many days. Dr. Enders found that injecting the virus into the tissue causes abnormal changes in the chromosomes—the tiny carriers of heredity in cells. The infected cells were transformed into new kinds of cells. "It is very difficult to determine whether the new cells are malignant," says Dr. Enders. "It is suggestive but not conclusive proof of cancer."

Other researchers, at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, found that "the virus produced a profound alteration in human cells, both in chromosomes and in cell structure. Once the changes occurred, they persisted in new generations of cells and eventually the changed cells replaced all the normal cells."

Other Vaccines Eyed Askance

"The monkey virus has provoked enough concern to cause a significant change in the Federal Government's view of vaccine production of many kinds," says Mr. Lawson. He continues:

> The change may be a major roadblock to early licensing of the new measles vaccine currently now being tested. . . . According to a drug industry virologist, the Government has told producers it will hold up licensing of the measles vaccine until viruses associated with cancer in chickens can be eliminated from the chicken embryo culture in which the vaccine is made. . . . No one knows whether this chicken virus will harm humans, but thus far no one wants to take a chance.

Other vaccines employing chicken embryo cultures include those against smallpox and rabies (using live but weakened agents to stimulate immunity) and those using killed viruses: against influenza, typhus, yellow fever, and infectious bronchitis.

The "roadblock," according to Mr. Lawson, is that "the Public Health Service has a long-standing rule that no extraneous viruses or other agents can be allowed into a vaccine." This protection is all to the good. One of the main reasons for these notes on Health and Therapy is to call attention to the problematical nature of many modern techniques and to note that some of the dangers are recognized, even by their proponents.

Smog Another Cancer Villain?

Smog, allied with influenza virus, is being considered as a possible causative agent in cancer—a New York *Times* item for April 18 suggests. Dr. Prindle, medical director of the Division of Air Pollution of the United States Public Health Service, noted particularly the work of Dr. Paul Kotin and associates in Los Angeles:

Dr. Kotin's group infected mice with influenza virus. Those who survived had a slightly higher cancer rate than mice that had not been infected with the virus. However, those of the flu survivors later exposed to an artificial smog of ozonized gasoline developed cancer at a rate many times higher than the others.

He said this appeared to be the first such production of lung cancer in animals by smog. He noted that the sex ratio was twenty-nine males to nine females, which, he said, is similar to the lung cancer ratio in human beings. This, he asserted, suggests that the preponderance of the disease in men is not a result of smoking or occupation.

A Heretical View

For those who are convinced that a person cannot be a prey to any disease unless and until its causative factors are structured in the astral body—that is, at the *psycho*-physiological level—the following observations may be of interest. In *Das Buch vom Es* (1923) Dr. Georg Grodeck, a German physician who specialized in cases which had been given up by other physicians and whose methods of treatment we would now call "natural" techniques plus psychoanalysis, wrote:

> With the help of our assiduous obedience to the dictates of anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, and statistics we have gradually made such progress that no one knows any longer what is to be called cancer and what is not. The consequence is that the word cancer . . . is spoken and is printed a hundred times a day, for what do men love to hear better than ghost stories? And since one can no longer believe in ghosts, this name, still indefinable in spite or by reason of so much scientific knowledge, which calls up so much that is grotesque and horrible in its associations, provides a good substitute for grizzly specters. . . .
>
> Of all the theories put forward in connection with cancer, only one has in my opinion survived the passage of time, namely, that cancer leads through definite stages to death. I mean by that what is not fatal is not cancer. From that you may conclude that I hold out no hope of a new method of curing cancer.

Need for Strict Control

The New York *Times* for April 12 reports that a drug sold widely in Europe and Great Britain as a soporific is held responsible for thousands of deformed babies. Dr. Helen B. Taussig, of Johns Hopkins Hospital, said at a news conference that "this compound (thalidomide) could have passed our present drug laws." That it did not do so was due to suspicions of Federal officials. According to the *Times*:

> Thalidomide appeared to be the greatest sleeping pill ever devised. It worked quickly and left no hangover. . . . The precise mechanism by which thalidomide might produce birth abnormalities is not known. Dr. Taussig, however, pointed out that the drug-caused deformation of the babies "is the most ghastly thing you have ever seen." In the malformation, usually both arms fail to grow. Sometimes the affliction causes both legs to fail. Sometimes both arms and legs are afflicted. . . . Further investigation with this drug and related chemical compounds may demonstrate that they interfere with organizer, or enzyme, function.

The recent nation-wide furor in newspapers and magazines over the Finkbine case dramatizes the protection given this country by the determination—even "stubbornness"—of the Federal drug official who steadfastly refused to permit the production of this drug in the U.S.

SMALLPOX VACCINATION RE-EVALUATED

The Los Angeles *Times* for July 26 noted that the British Medical Association has recently "called on the government for a review of its policy of vaccinating infants against smallpox." "We feel," a spokesman said, "it is time a sensible brake was put on vaccination." The A.P. dispatch summarizes:

> The spokesman said views which are now becoming widespread among British doctors were to some extent crystalized Tuesday by Dr. George Dick. Dick [a leading expert on Virus diseases] told the convention that the idea of vaccinating every baby should be abandoned. Instead, he said, the government should tighten controls at airports and harbors to prevent the disease entering Britain. A subcommittee of the BMA Public Health Committee . . . asked for an expert committee to "reassess the advisability of advocating routine infant vaccination."

Reportorial discussion of the subject with Los Angeles Health Department officials elicited the following:

> A City Health Department physician confirmed the statement by a British doctor that smallpox vaccination causes more illness and deaths than the disease itself but added: "This is the price we must pay for protecting the whole population."